

REMARKS

New claims 12-23 are added. Support for the new claims are provided by exemplary embodiments of the invention disclosed by the originally-filed application at, for example, paragraphs 15-40.

Claims 5, 8, and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. New claim 23 is such rewritten dependent claim 5, and therefore, new claim 23 is in allowable form.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Holderer, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,229,657).

Independent claim 1 is amended to recite "an optical assembly having a housing structure that encloses at least one optical element in an imaging device which has a number of optical assemblies, wherein the optical assembly is suspended via at least one decoupling element contacting the housing structure and a supporting structure." Holderer teaches a decoupling element 4 contacting a ring 3 and a mount 5, not a housing structure and a supporting structure as positively recited. Holderer fails to teach or suggest a positively recited limitation of claim 1, and therefore, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-11 depend from allowable independent claim 1, and therefore, the dependent claims are allowable for depending from an allowable independent claim.

New independent claim 12 recites "wherein the objective is suspended via at least one decoupling element in at least one area in a supporting structure." Holderer can only be properly characterized as suspending a lens 1 (Figs. 1-6), not an objective as positively

recited. Consequently, Holderer fails to teach or suggest a positively recited limitation of claim 12, and therefore, claim 12 is allowable.

Claims 13-15 depend from allowable independent claim 12, and therefore, the dependent claims are allowable for depending from an allowable independent claim. Moreover, dependent claim 15 recites to limitations stated to be allowable in the present action.

New independent claim 16 recites “wherein the catadioptic objective is suspended via at least one decoupling element in at least one area in a supporting structure.” Holderer can only be properly characterized as suspending a lens 1 (Figs. 1-6), not a catadioptic objective as positively recited. Consequently, Holderer fails to teach or suggest a positively recited limitation of claim 16, and therefore, claim 16 is allowable.

Claims 17-18 depend from allowable independent claim 16, and therefore, the dependent claims are allowable for depending from an allowable independent claim. Moreover, dependent claims 17-18 recite to limitations stated to be allowable in the present action.

New independent claim 19 recites “at least one decoupling element extending between an exterior of the objective and a support structure.” Holderer can only be properly characterized as teaching a lens 1 as being suspended (Figs. 1-6), and not extending between an exterior of the objective and a support structure as positively recited. Consequently, Holderer fails to teach or suggest a positively recited limitation of claim 19, and therefore, claim 19 is allowable.

Claims 20-22 depend from allowable independent claim 19, and therefore, the dependent claims are allowable for depending from an allowable independent claim.

Moreover, dependent claims 20-22 recite to limitations stated to be allowable in the present action.

This application is now believed to be in immediate condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested. If the Examiner's next anticipated action is to be anything other than a Notice of Allowance, the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone interview prior to issuance of any such subsequent action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11-2-07

By: 
D. Brent Kenady
Reg. No. 40,045